

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated November 24, 2006, claims 1-13 are cancelled, and claims 14-23 are newly added. Claims 14-23 are now active in this application. No new matter has been added. New dependent claims 16-23 depend from independent claim 14, and respectively include the limitations of cancelled claims 3-10.

The drawings were objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a) for allegedly failing to show every feature of the invention specified in the claims, including the term “the second contained CPU” in claim 11. Claim 11 has been cancelled.

Thus, Applicants submit that the objection the drawings is moot. Additionally, the term “the second contained CPU” is not used in any pending claims.

Claims 5-10 were objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.75(c) as allegedly being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim cannot depend on any other multiple dependent claim. Claims 5-10 have been cancelled.

Thus, Applicants submit that the objection to claims 5-10 is moot. Additionally, the new claims are in proper form.

Claims 12 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement regarding the term “priority.” Claims 12 and 13 have been cancelled.

Thus, Applicants submit that this rejection of claims 12 and 13 is moot. Additionally, the new claims do not use the term “priority.”

Claims 1 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Furuhashi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,180,864) hereinafter Furuhashi ‘864. Claims 1 and 11 have been cancelled.

Thus, Applicants submit that this rejection of claims 1 and 11 as being anticipated is moot.

Claims 2-10, 12, and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over various combinations of the following references: Furuhashi ‘864 in view of Falik et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,532,507) hereinafter Falik ‘507; Moyer (U.S. Patent No. 6,845,419); Furuhashi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,427,181) herein after Furuhashi ‘181; Ishii et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,890,210), hereinafter Ishii ‘210; and Zulian (U.S. Patent No. 5,870,560). Claims 2-10, 12, and 13 have been cancelled.

Thus, Applicants submit that this rejection of claims 2-10, 12, and 13 as being unpatentable is moot.

Independent claim 14 recites, “**a contained CPU; a first bus connected to the contained CPU; a second bus connected to an external CPU; and a bus adjusting circuit disposed between the first bus and the second bus to exclusively control accesses to the external CPU and the contained CPU to a device connected to the first bus; wherein, when a chip select signal and an address to access the device connected to the first bus from the external CPU are inputted during an access to the device connected to the first bus by the contained CPU, the bus adjusting circuit inputs the address to the first bus from the second bus by releasing a wait signal to permit the external CPU to access the device connected to the first bus and connecting the second bus to the first bus after stopping the access of the contained CPU to the first bus.**” Emphasis added.

Furuhashi '864 merely discloses a "main bus" 12 at FIG. 2 and FIG. 4, and does not teach or suggest the recited limitation of claim 14.

Falik '507 merely discloses a "LOGIC AND STATE MACHINE" 121 at FIG. 2, and does not teach or suggest the recited limitation of claim 14.

Moyer merely discloses an "INTERRUPT ENABLE REGISTER" 140 at FIG. 2, and does not teach or suggest the recited limitation of claim 14.

Furuhashi '181 merely discloses a "HOST CPU 2 ACQUIRE RIGHT TO USE SYSTEM BUS 21" at block S3 of FIG. 3, and does not teach or suggest the recited limitation of claim 14.

Ishii '210 merely discloses an "INTERRUPT DISK READING" step C7 at FIG. 4, and does not teach or suggest the recited limitation of claim 14.

Zulian merely discloses a "conventional fixed-priority arbitration network" at column 8, line 41 and element 44, FIG. 5, and does not teach or suggest the recited limitation of claim 14.

Thus, the cited prior art, alone or in combination, does not teach or suggest all of the elements of independent claim 14.

Dependent claims 15-23 depend from claim 14, and are allowable for at least the same reasons as independent claim 14.

Accordingly, it is urged that the application, as now amended, is in condition for allowance, an indication of which is respectfully solicited. If there are any outstanding issues that might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner's amendment, Examiner is requested to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number shown below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP

Michael E. Fogarty
Registration No. 36,139

Please recognize our Customer No. 53080
as our correspondence address.

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 MEF/EG:cac
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: February 26, 2007

WDC99 1352945-1.061282.0047